

**CALFRESH REQUEST FOR POLICY INTERPRETATION****PI# 17-59**

**INSTRUCTIONS:** Complete items 1 - 10 on the form. Use a separate form for each policy interpretation request. If additional space is needed, please use the second page. Retain a copy for your records and submit via email to CalFresh-PI@dss.ca.gov.

**Please note:** the policy interpretation provided is based on the unique set of facts presented and should not be assumed to apply in all scenarios.

1. RESPONSE NEEDED DUE TO: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Policy/Regulation Interpretation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> QC <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: QC error cited		5. DATE OF REQUEST: <b>07/26/2017</b>	NEED RESPONSE BY: <b>08/04/2017</b>
2. REQUESTOR NAME:		6. COUNTY/ORGANIZATION: <b>Stanislaus County</b>	
3. PHONE NO.:	EMAIL:	7. SUBJECT: <b>VUR and anticipated income</b>	
4. REGULATION CITE(S):		8. REFERENCES: <i>(Include ACL/ACIN, court cases, etc. in references)</i> <b>NOTE: All requests must have a regulation cite(s) and/or a reference(s).</b>  <b>I-58-I13E, ACL 12-25</b>	

9. QUESTION: (INCLUDE SCENARIO IF NEEDED FOR CLARITY):

-Part of the definition of VUR is that information comes from the primary source and not further information is needed.

-If an AU/household anticipates receipt of new income from a new source in the upcoming SAR Payment Period, such as a new job or UI benefits, this income shall only be considered reasonably anticipated if the CWD determines that:

1. The AU/household verifies that the income has been or will be approved or authorized within the upcoming SAR period, or the household is otherwise reasonably certain that the income will be received within the SAR period;
2. The anticipated amount of the income is known and verified, or the AU/household is otherwise reasonably certain of the amount of the income; and
3. The start date of the income is known and verified, or the AU/household is otherwise reasonably certain of the start date

10. REQUESTOR'S PROPOSED ANSWER:

No this is not VUR and should not be used to reasonably anticipate income. Since the county did not have the PVS or any other documentation showing this had been received/approved, this income should not have been used in the budget. Once the PVS or pay stubs is received, then the income must be used in the budget, allowing for a 10 day NOA.

11. STATE POLICY RESPONSE (CFPB USE ONLY):

The State concurs with the proposed response.

**FOR CDSS USE**

DATE RECEIVED:

**07/26/2017**

DATE RESPONDED TO COUNTY/ALJ:

**08/01/2017**

**CALFRESH REQUEST FOR POLICY INTERPRETATION (Continued)****PI#17-59**

1. RESPONSE NEEDED DUE TO: <input type="checkbox"/> Policy/Regulation Interpretation <input type="checkbox"/> QC <input type="checkbox"/> Other:		5. DATE OF REQUEST:	NEED RESPONSE BY:
2. REQUESTOR NAME:		6. COUNTY/ORGANIZATION:	
3. PHONE NO.:	EMAIL:	7. SUBJECT:	
4. REGULATION CITE(S):		8. REFERENCES: <i>(Include ACL/ACIN, court cases, etc. in references)</i> <b>NOTE: All requests must have a regulation cite(s) and/or a reference(s).</b>	

We received a QC error because SDI income was not used for 2/2017 (mid period for VUR). The customer called the county on 1/19/2017 to let us know that she turned in disability paperwork. She did not tell us that her SDI had been approved or that she was expecting SDI. The county did not receive the PVS until 02/2017 showing that the customer had started receiving SDI.

The paperwork that the customer provided was a Notice of Computation. This notice showed the the customer had applied for disability and if she was eligible what her weekly benefit amount would be, claim effective date, maximum benefit amount, and her wages by quarter ending. There is nothing on this paper work that documents that her SDI had been approved or that a check had been issued to her.

1. Based on a notice of computation, should the counties be using this to reasonably anticipate income? This does not meet the criteria above for anticipating income. There is no information that The start date of the income is known and verified, or the AU/household is otherwise reasonably certain of the start date. In our case, there was no documentation that the customer stated she was in receipt of this or that benefits had been approved, only that she gave us disability paperwork.

2. If we receive a notice of computation or another document showing the customer has applied for SDI or UIB, should the county be using this as VUR and start using this income in the budget (even though this does not verify that the customer received the income)?

We are getting ready to provide VUR training to staff and need a response to this by 8/5/2017.